6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

178 538 156

events were apparently manifested in a widespread sense of emotional and physical insecurity which fostered destructive aggression and mass violence. In such circumstances extreme self-seeking and dominance-submission relationships tended to substitute the Old-Slavonic egalitarian and anarchic system.

565 538

The plight of the Slavonic peasant strata has been symbolized in these products of folk imagination in the person of Mikula Selyaninovich ("the Villager's son") and in that of Ilya of Murom, who is often referred to as "the peasant's son," and as "the old Cossak." Mikula is pictured as a superb plowman and field laborer. He has a keen knowledge of husbandry and possesses the best mares and the best farming equipment.[24] He is endowed with such tremendous strength and is entrusted with such heavy responsibility that he carries "the weight of the whole world" in a little shoulder bag. This villager, however, comes into conflict with the city people over the custom duties and over the haughty manner of the urbanites. The tolls imposed by the city are too high. Moreover, the burghers treat Mikula in a despicable and undignified way. So he is enraged and loses his self-control:

[369]

> I was in the city no longer ago than the day before yesterday,
> On my light bay mare,
> I carried thence two whole bags of salt,
> Two bags of salt of forty pud each.
> The folk there are no better than robbers.
> They demand two kopecks toll;
> But I had a leaded whip for toll
> I paid their two kopecks toll.
> Whoever was upright I left seated
> And whoever was seated I left prostrate,
> And whoever lay prostrate would never rise again.[25]

As a result of such conflicts, Mikula finally came to the conclusion that tilling was not profitable any more. He found that there were other and better ways which would guarantee to one safety, economic gain, and self-respect. So he gave up husbandry and joined Volga Buslavlevich, the bandit-warrior. In his new role in which he uses great physical power not as a productive force, but as a means of coercion, he makes a strong imprint on

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

ture was detrimental to the development of trade and industry. For centuries its economy remained founded on a system of primitive agriculture. Lack of large centers of trade and industry adversely affected rural economy. There was no stimulation for agricultural improvements and for freeing of the serfs. Instead, the emphasis was on the exploitation of serf labor as the most expedient means to satisfy the demands of the landlords and of the state. The landlords were mostly absent on military campaigns or other state duties and were generally disinterested in land improvements. At the same time the system of using the land as a pay for military or other state services, in a country whose war campaigns and military contingents were increasing, tended to diminish the size of the donations and increase the burdens imposed on the serfs.

The lack of urbanization, together with the low standard of education of the service nobility, kept also the intellectual development of Russia far behind that in the West. Intellectual activity was limited mainly to the court circles. The ideology and practices of the Russian Church favored intellectual stagnation. Russia accepted Christianity from Byzantium after the Greek Church had already given up classical traditions of Hellenism. By the time Byzantine Christianity entered Russia, Byzantine literature had assumed an almost exclusively ecclesiastical character, and education consisted almost entirely of religious teaching and the reading of the lives of the saints. Art, too, became exclusively religious and stereotyped. All thought was regimented according to religious dogmas and political objectives of the power-holders.

In Russia this type of intellectual rigidity and inactivity was emphasized because of the use of the Old-Slavonic language in the Church, which resulted in neglect of Greek language. And it was considered a sin to learn the "thrice accursed Latin tongue." Thus, the Russian clergymen became isolated from the West because they lacked the possession of the only instruments in which human knowledge was communicated in those days. Moreover, Russian Orthodoxy, like the Byzantine Orthodoxy, was based on monasticism. But unlike the manifold monastic practices of the Western Church, the monks in the Russian Church tended to lead an inactive life of asceticism aimed at personal salvation.

6: Tomatic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

his wife"; "The husband is the law unto his wife," the proverbs say. As a result of such a view of husband-wife relations, the husband had the right and duty to apply brutal force to his wife as a means of discipline, the same as to his children. "It is woman's fate to be always beaten," the people would say.[20]

The description of folk life in the eastern parts of Russia corroborate this attitude toward wives as expressed in popular sayings. The informants tell of the "miserable fate of the women" (*nepriglyadnaya uchast zheny*),[21] the constant fights of husband and wife (*muzh deretsya s zhenoi*), and the thrashing (*poboi*) to which the wives were exposed on the part of their husbands. In case of adultery the punishment for the woman was "merciless beating" (*neshchadnoe bitie*) or strangling (*udushenie*).[22]

Domostroy, which was under the influence of Church teachings, agrees with this philosophy and practices and even offers elaborate and detailed precepts to the husband about how to treat his wife ". . . if the wife is not afraid of the punishment and does not follow the instructions, the husband should beat her." According to Domostroy only if the wife is blindly and unconditionally submissive "everything will run smoothly in the family." The wife must do everything "to please her husband and God and she must listen to him with fear and awe."[23]

Domostroy was compiled primarily for the urban classes of the Czardom. Its rules reflect a certain deterioration in the status of women as they moved from the peasant to the urban level. In the cities, especially among the merchants, the women were confined to the *terem* (gyneceum) and had less opportunity to work and earn for themselves. In the urban environment, the Turco-Mongol influences were therefore reinforced.

In the rural areas the women retained their role in economic production. The peasant women were thus enabled to retain some of the the Old-Slavonic traditions; they often knew how to assert themselves and influence family affairs. In a like manner, with the increasing opportunities for schooling in urban centers, a growing number of city women emancipated themselves from family ties and became economically and socially independent. In such circumstances also many women in the urban

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

562 369 middle and upper strata knew how to assert themselves and increase their role and influence, thus reviving the Old-Slavonic traditions.

III

593 152 Though the father was to be severe and strict, he was expected also to love his wife and his children. Just like God in Heaven, father's duty was to inflict harsh punishment, but he was also to show compassion, kindness, understanding and constant solicitude for the members of his household. He was responsible before God and men for the failings and misdeeds of his family members, and he was therefore to look after their well-being and salvation. Thus love and violence were often mingled in the Great-Russian family. A number of folk sayings express this ambivalent trait of attachment and hostility when referring to the attitudes and behavior of the father. "To love one's wife is to hold her in terror" (*Lyubit zhenu-derzhat grozu*); "Whom I love I thrash" (*Kovo lyublyu togo i biyu*).[24]

One of the basic underlying motives in the father's violence seems to have been his self-seeking and urge for dominance as well as a need for succor. "Beat your wife oftener, it will be useful for the future," the men would say. The Domostroy justifies child beating in a similar manner ". . . he will comfort you in your old age and will give beauty to your soul. . . . and he will make you happy when he grows up. . . . and your enemies will envy you. If you will be weak in his childhood, he will make you suffer when he grows up; will set your soul on edge."[25]

There is in some proverbs also an indication of an expectation of "masochistic" indulgence according to which violence and deprivation would arouse love. "Not to beat one's wife is not to be loved by her" (*zhenu ne bit i milu ne byt*),[26] the people would say. In a folk song, for instance, the husband buys gifts for his wife, but it is of no avail. When the husband buys a knut and gives his wife a beating with it, it is only then that she responds with love. In another folk song the wife boasts the knuting "is an honor to me and is not painful" (*Mne to za chest, ne bolno.*)[27]

Though the father felt dependent upon his wife and children

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RFI Great Russia RFI

178 565 793 In the new secularized and urbanized society, also, the position of the clergy became increasingly precarious. Like other institutions of the Czardom the Russian Orthodox Church was organized along the lines of sharp social differentiation and dominance-submission relationships. Russian Orthodox clergy as a whole formed a closed caste institution. All lay clergymen and many monastics were recruited from among the members of the [582] families of lay clergy. Endogamous marriage was practiced within this caste. The church maintained its own schools for both the sons and the daughters of clergymen. In this manner [184] the clergy had been separated from the rest of the society and had developed a sub-culture of its own. The clerics were set apart from others not only by their priestly garb, but by their manners, and even by their names.

792 793 554 Internally, however, within the ranks of the Orthodox clergy there was a sharp distinction between the monastic order (black clergy) and the secular priesthood (white clergy). The monastic order was rich in land donations and other possessions and all the Church hierarchy was recruited from among its ranks. The secular clergy was not only subordinate to the monastics, but also poor. Among the secular clergy sharp class distinction existed between the city clergy and the village priests. This differentiation was manifested in the differences in income, education and prestige, as well as in the lack of intermarriage between these strata. The difference was also reflected in the attitudes of [364] the laity. While the city clergy were socially accepted by the middle and lower urban layers, the village priests were rather isolated from the rest of the population.

However, the sharpest difference and social distance existed between the Church hierarchy and the rank-and-file clergymen. The heads of monasteries, for instance, behaved like real magnates. They took in large revenues, kept servants, horses and carriages, and hardly shared in the life of their monastic brothers, even though these Church dignitaries resided in monasteries. In the same way, the bishops were inclined to belittle the lay clergy under their control. They treated them with a great want of respect. They would abuse them, insult them and then even flog them.

2/1 [i.e. developing in the second half of the XIX th century — Analyst]

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

that "If all laws perished the people would live in truth and justice."[7]

The peasant realized that there was sharp differentiation in economic status in his society as well as in his own local community. But what he especially resented was that the men of wealth took advantage of their position to oppress the weak; and that the poor had to be utterly submissive and subservient to the well-to-do. "The one who is better off has long hands," the peasants would say, meaning that the men of wealth had control over others. And he would compare the arbitrariness of the man of power with the craftsman who handles his material according to his will. "The master is like the carpenter: he cuts the way it pleases him." He would also say that the rich man has all the space he wants "as much as the pike in the water," but as "for the poor there is nowhere any room." He resented the fact that though "Poverty was not sin, yet the people laughed at it." He also objected that the poor were forced to repress their real feelings and cringe before the rich. "The poor are angry at the rich, yet they find themselves in their trail with cap in hand," he would complain.[8]

The peasant therefore grew distrustful and resentful of everyone who was in one way or other above him. He could not depend much upon God and Czar, and he mistrusted the bureaucrats, the landlords, the priests, the judges, the police, and even the better-off people of his own strata. He was particularly distrustful of cities and city folk, of Moscow and Moscovites especially. From ancient times he looked upon Moscow, the seat of the Czar's government, as heartless and deceitful, and as the source of most of his troubles. "In Moscow," he thought, "you find everything except own father and mother." He also considered that his capital city was so corrupted that, "If you go to Moscow you must take there your last penny."

The peasant therefore lived in an environment in which he felt deserted by the powers of heaven and oppressed by their representatives on earth. He therefore felt unprotected, isolated, friendless, lonely, and insecure. His idea was that both God and man were against him. "If God attacks you, good people will attack you too," he would complain.

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

This trend to expropriate the peasants and to overspecialize them as a means of political and economic control found its expression in the recent development of Bolshevik ideology. In the utterances of Party leaders and in the Soviet press it is being stressed that the conditions in the Soviet Union are already so advanced that the Soviet state is ready to move from socialism into the first levels of a limited Communism. This first phase of Communism will consist of the elimination of differences between industrial and agricultural work, between industrial workers and the peasantry ("Liquidating the contrast between the city and the village"). Thus it is pointed out, the old opposition between the country and the city will vanish and also cultural and psychological differences between these two strata will disappear. Every person will become engaged in a special "technical-engineering" task and all will be equal and like brothers.

As a result of such development, it is said that even the differences between the manual laborer and the intellectual worker will eventually be abolished and thus the classless and anarchic society envisaged in socialist writings and rooted in the traditions of the Slav culture will be finally achieved.[11] Productive forces will develop an abundance of all consumer goods whose distribution will be on the basis of exchange and according to one's needs. There will be no monetary relations and no differences in social status.

It is clearly and repeatedly emphasized, however, that nobody should mistake this change from socialism to communism as a "withering away" of the state. The state, say the Bolsheviks, must remain "strong" for the needs of defense,[12] until the Soviet system spreads over the entire earth.

II

Total power concentrated in the hands of Bolshevik conspirators as a means of perpetuation of their rule led to compulsory regimentation of all labor, to speed-up system, and to intensified differentiation in skill, income, and status within the working classes. The aim of these measures is to increase production and to control the working classes by breaking their group solidarity and by tying the laborer to his machine and the office worker to

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

welcomed them as liberators in World War II, indicate such possibilities.

III

In studying personality growth in the Soviet society, one should take into account also the differences between the urban and the rural environments and the influences of those environments on interpersonal relations within the family circle. Owing to the very rapid pace of urbanization and low rate of production of consumption goods, most of the families located in the urban areas are exposed to the housing shortage and lack of home privacy. Many of these families live in community apartments in which there is only one room per family and in which a number of unrelated families share a common kitchen and toilet facilities. Family conflicts and tensions tend to be intensified in such circumstances. Lack of privacy, noisiness, and lack of sleep in crowded quarters, together with the lack of sufficient food, long hours of work and unsatisfactory conditions of work increase dissatisfactions and magnify existing family conflicts. An outlet for dissatisfactions is found then in trivial scandals and bickering, in petty squabbles, but also in violent emotional outbursts.[31]

Conditions in rural areas are somewhat different. Though virtually all peasant families live in one or at most two-room cottages, which they often share with a few heads of livestock, yet the rural family does have its own privacy. Most peasant families possess a small lot of land around the cottage, on which they raise some poultry or a pig; some might even own a cow. Though this is all very modest, yet with some labor, after the work for the kolhoz has been done, the peasant family has been able to raise some food on its own property and perhaps to sell it on the open market and then buy some clothing and other bare necessities.[32]

Compared to the situation of the city worker, the peasant, though receiving lower wages for his work, and often going in rags, perhaps does feel relatively more independent. If he is an adult with a family he is much less likely to be pushed around, though he is constantly exhorted by kolhoz officials to work more

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RFI Great Russia RFI

and harder and to produce more for Socialist Motherland. Not infrequently the brigade leaders have to use physical force to make him get up early enough to work on collective property.

Yet in spite of such unfavorable circumstances, compared to city workers, the peasant might still be in a somewhat better position in regard to security and stability, attachment to his family, to his cottage, to his small plot of land, and to his village. For this reason he has been able to put up resistance against the Party and the government.[33] It is against these scanty remnants of emotional and economic security, of personal independence, of group solidarity and resistance that the Bolshevik rulers are campaigning; it is to eradicate this psychology of group intimacy and opposition that the Party had recently attempted to resettle the farmers and move them into concentrated and urbanized surroundings; the Bolsheviks are exerting all efforts to eradicate these "residues of kulak psychology" root and branch and to make the peasants as completely helpless, insecure and subdued to the Party will as they have done with the industrial and intellectual workers.

There is a considerable disproportion in sex ratio in Soviet rural areas. Owing to great casualties in wars it is estimated that at present there are about fifteen million more women than men in the Soviet Union. And due to the increasing need of manpower to maintain huge military forces and to feed the inefficient city industries, the Soviet leaders are constantly draining both male youths and adult men from the villages in the form of military and labor drafts. They are therefore increasingly relying for agricultural work on peasant women. Hence peasant villages and peasant families tend to be composed predominantly of women.

Here too a family structure with semi-matriarchal traits, similar to the Old-Slavonic family, is being formed. Though in such circumstances the number of illegitimate children is increasing, it is quite possible that the women, especially those who are traditionally strongly attached to their family, are exerting a moderating and softening influence on the personality of the peasant child. An indication of such possible differences in the psychological atmosphere of the city and the country is given in

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

594
369

those accounts of Soviet life in which the gloomy appearance of the city populace is contrasted to the more optimistic outlook of the country folk.[34]

25
DESTRUCTIVE AGGRESSION

I

642

PROMPTED by extreme power-seeking and by deeply rooted mistrust of their own subjects, the Bolsheviks have built a monolithic Party-state system which differs in the degree of its rigidity and power concentration from all other systems of despotism, theocracy, military dictatorship, totalitarian and police state. In those autocratic political systems not all aspects of life are regimented. A certain limited degree of freedom is left at least in some spheres of personal and of group behavior. But the main difference between these systems and the Bolshevik regime is that while the former prohibits only those activities which have a direct negative bearing upon perpetuation of the system, the latter allows only such behavior as has a direct positive bearing upon the perpetuation of the ruling faction in power.

641
557

In the Soviet society the ruling class is not content with mere passive acceptance of the Bolshevik rule. It demands of each subject a "positive attitude" toward the regime. In such a society there is necessarily a premium in terms of privileges and power for the activities in the fields of political organization and agitation, of vigilance and violence, as well as in the fields of labor-driving, economic management, and military preparedness, since it is in the main upon such activities that perpetuation of Bolshevism depends. In such a "prison and barracks society", it is the calculating and ambitious careerists and zealous devotees and watchdogs, specialists in conspiracy and violence who climb toward the top levels of the Soviet political and social pyramid where blind obedience, crouching servility, jockeying for positions and power, and advancing on the cadavers of one's associates become a matter of survival.